

or should recuse herself because her husband had an opinion; but some of these same liberals, so-called, took the position that, gee, if Clarence Thomas' wife has a position, he must be disqualified.

The hypocrisy goes on and on.

Hopefully, Justice Kagan will tell us all of the emails, allow us to see all of the emails that were sent, all of the consultations in which she was a part. Then we'll see the truth.

This bill required the spending of \$105 billion at a time we didn't have \$105 billion. We're having to borrow over \$42 billion, \$43 billion, \$44 billion of that from other places, including from China. China doesn't mind seeing this happen. I think they realize it will bring down this Nation financially.

The President said it would cost less than \$1 trillion to implement. Well, the first CBO score came back over \$1 trillion. The Director of CBO called over to the White House. He comes back and says, You know, it's more like \$800 billion. Then once it gets in place, he says, You know what, we had a mathematical error or two. It's actually over \$1 trillion.

That's why CBO deserves to have a margin of error of 25 percent, plus or minus.

We keep coming back to this one thing, that this bill is not nearly as much about health care as it is about the government's running everything—running individual lives. Sam Adams, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, those who gave their lives for our freedoms, would never have stood for this. The government's running everything? But it's true. If the Federal Government can do this, there is nothing that is closed to the government's direction and law. If the government has the right to direct everyone's health care, then this opens the bedroom to Federal Government jurisdiction like nothing ever has, not immediately but eventually.

Is that what people want? Do you want the Federal Government being able to say, This practice is okay. This one in the bedroom is not okay because, see, we're in charge of your health care, and we've seen that it ends up costing more if you do this, that or the other, so we're going to prohibit that?

If they can direct against someone's religious beliefs and that certain bedroom practices will be allowed, they can direct which ones can't be. If they can direct what the Catholic Church or Catholic individual has to provide or pay for, they can sure tell them what they can't engage in as well. This opens a door to the government's running everything like never before.

This month marks 2 years that it has been passed against the will of the American people, against the will of most State legislatures, against the Constitution. Is it a tax? Is it not a tax? It appears this administration will say whatever it has to say to try to get this held as constitutional. I can say

unequivocally, if the Supreme Court were to hold this bill and its mandates and its intrusions into every area of personal being as constitutional, it will give me no satisfaction to someday say to a Justice of the Supreme Court whose religious beliefs have been violated, I told you so. None.

It will break many of our hearts that there was such blindness, but I have that hope that spring is eternal in the human breast, that there is still enough reliance on the Constitution, itself, and on our Supreme Court that they will recognize the door that is open, that they will recognize the inconsistencies of this administration in trying to come up with some argument to justify these violations of our freedoms.

Some say that States require you to have auto insurance. That's only if you're going to drive on their roads. If you're going to participate in that privilege, then, yes; but nobody is required to have auto insurance if they're not going to drive a car on their highways. In fact, the only insurance that has been required by any State mandatorily is insurance to cover others who might be harmed by an individual's driving and harming them. I don't know of a State that requires insurance on individuals hurting themselves while they're driving, only liability.

Now, we do have the problem in Massachusetts where Massachusetts basically had a mandate. Other than that mandate in Massachusetts, no State has ever been able or even thought of or tried to require the purchase of a product.

Oh, this is going to be for the working poor.

Look, we already have Medicare and Medicaid. Until this administration, with the help of Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID in the Senate, gutted \$500 billion out of Medicare, until that happened, there was not going to be any damage to Medicare. We were going to take care of our seniors and take care of our poor. But if you look in this bill as I have—and I've been through the whole thing—you will find out, if you are just above the poverty line—if you're working, if you're doing everything you can to get by, to make it with your family, but can't afford as good an insurance policy as is mandated by the Federal Government—that this administration wants you to have an additional tax on your income as if that's going to help.

This hurts the working poor. It devastates Medicare by pitting people against our seniors, taking \$500 billion away from Medicare. It's time for America to rise up again and make clear: This is unconstitutional. And I think even the Supreme Court would hear that, when Americans rise up and say, You're not governing every aspect of my personal life like this opens the door to doing.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on February 22, 2012 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3630. To provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 29, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5115. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-154] received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5116. A letter from the Chairperson, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5117. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Export Administration Regulations: Addition of a Reference to a Provision of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (ISA) and Statement of the Licensing Policy for Transactions Involving Persons Sanctioned under the ISA [Docket No.: 110718395-1482-01] (RIN: 0694-AF30) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5118. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 22-11 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)), and Sections 603-604 (Middle East